

71455
J. V. STALIN

E-1236
INTERVIEW
WITH
PRAVDA
CORRESPONDENT



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE
MOSCOW 1951

*Mr. Stanislas Reddy M. D. N.
Nakeroskal Constituency.
DIST. NALGONDA-A. P.*

C. 87609

J. V. S T A L I N

INTERVIEW WITH

PRAVDA

CORRESPONDENT



FOREIGN LANGUAGES PUBLISHING HOUSE

Moscow 1951

A correspondent of the newspaper *Pravda* recently put a series of questions on foreign affairs to J. V. Stalin, to which Comrade Stalin gave the following answers.

Question: What is your opinion of British Premier Attlee's latest assertion in the House of Commons that the Soviet Union did not disarm, that is, did not demobilize its armies, after the termination of the war, and has ever since been steadily increasing its armed forces?

Answer: I consider Premier Attlee's assertion a slander upon the Soviet Union.

All the world knows that the Soviet Union did demobilize its armies after the war. The demobilization, as is known, was carried out in three stages: the first and second stages in the course of 1945, and

the third stage between May and September 1946. Furthermore, in 1946 and 1947 the higher age categories of the Soviet Army were demobilized, and the last of the higher age categories were demobilized at the beginning of 1948.

These are the generally known facts.

If Premier Attlee were versed in financial or economic science he would have no difficulty in understanding that no state, not excluding the Soviet State, can develop its civilian industry to the full, undertake great construction works like the hydroelectric stations on the Volga, the Dnieper and the Amu Darya, which require tens of billions in budgetary outlays, continue a policy of systematically reducing prices of articles of mass consumption, which likewise requires tens of billions in budgetary outlays, and invest hundreds of billions in the rehabilitation of the national economy shattered by the German invaders, and at the same time, simultaneously with this, enlarge its armed forces and expand its war industry. It should not be difficult to

understand that such a witless policy would lead to the bankruptcy of the state. Premier Attlee should know from his own experience, and from the experience of the U.S.A., that increasing the armed forces of a country and a drive for armaments lead to the expansion of war industry, to the curtailment of civilian industry, to the suspension of big civilian construction works, to higher taxes and higher prices for articles of mass consumption. It should be clear that if the Soviet Union is not curtailing, but on the contrary enlarging civilian industry, is not contracting, but on the contrary expanding the construction of gigantic new hydroelectric stations and irrigation systems, is not abandoning, but on the contrary continuing the policy of reducing prices, then it cannot at the same time boost its war industry and enlarge its armed forces without running the risk of landing in bankruptcy.

And if, in spite of all these facts and scientific considerations, Premier Attlee still deems it possible openly to libel the

Soviet Union and its peaceful policy, this can only be explained by the fact that he hopes, by libelling the Soviet Union, to justify the armament drive now being carried out in Britain by the Labour Government.

Premier Attlee has to lie about the Soviet Union, he has to make out that the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union is an aggressive policy, and the aggressive policy of the British government a peaceful policy, in order to mislead the British people, force upon them these lies about the U.S.S.R., and thus inveigle them by deceit into a new world war, which the ruling circles of the United States of America are engineering.

Premier Attlee poses as a supporter of peace. But if he really stands for peace, why did he reject the Soviet Union's proposal in the United Nations that the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the United States of America, China and France immediately conclude a Pact of Peace?

If he really stands for peace, why did he

reject the Soviet Union's proposals for an immediate reduction of armaments and the immediate banning of the atomic weapon?

If he really stands for peace, why does he persecute peace supporters, and why did he ban the holding of the Peace Congress in Britain? Can a campaign for peace be a threat to Britain's security?

It is clear that Premier Attlee stands not for the maintenance of peace, but for the unleashing of another aggressive world war.

Question: What do you think of the intervention in Korea, and how is it likely to end?

Answer: If Great Britain and the United States of America definitely reject the peace proposals of the People's Government of China, the war in Korea can only end in defeat for the interventionists.

Question: Why? Are the American and British generals and officers inferior to the Chinese and Korean?

Answer: No, they are not. The American and British generals and officers are not a whit inferior to the generals and officers of any other country. As to the soldiers of the U.S.A. and Great Britain, they, as we know, gave a good account of themselves in the war against Hitler Germany and militarist Japan. What, then, is the reason? The reason is that the soldiers regard the war against Korea and China as unjust, whereas the war against Hitler Germany and militarist Japan they regarded as fully just. The fact is that this war is extremely unpopular with the American and British soldiers.

Indeed, it is hard to convince the soldiers that China, who is threatening neither Britain nor America, and from whom the Americans have seized the Island of Taiwan, is an aggressor, and that the United States of America, who seized the Island of Taiwan and brought her troops to the very frontiers of China, is a defensive party. It is hard to convince the soldiers that the United States of America has the right

to defend her security on the territory of Korea and at the frontiers of China, and that China and Korea have not the right to defend their security on their own territory or at the frontiers of their states. Hence the unpopularity of the war with the American and British soldiers.

It should be clear that the most experienced generals and officers may sustain defeat if the soldiers consider that the war forced upon them is profoundly unjust, and if, by reason of this, they perform their duties at the front perfunctorily, without faith in the righteousness of their mission, without enthusiasm.

Question: What is your opinion of the United Nations (UNO) decision declaring the Chinese People's Republic an aggressor?

Answer: I consider it a shameful decision.

Indeed, one must have lost all vestige of conscience to assert that the United States of America, who has seized Chinese

territory, the Island of Taiwan, and invaded Korea as far as the frontiers of China, is a defensive party, and that the Chinese People's Republic, which is defending its frontiers and trying to recover the Island of Taiwan, seized by the Americans, is an aggressor.

The United Nations, which was founded as a bulwark of peace, is turning into an instrument of war, into a means of precipitating another world war. The aggressive core of UNO comprises ten member countries of the aggressive North-Atlantic pact (U.S.A., Great Britain, France, Canada, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, Denmark, Norway and Iceland) and twenty Latin-American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela). It is the representatives of these countries that now decide the destiny of war and peace in UNO. It is they that carried through UNO the disgrace-

ful decision declaring the Chinese People's Republic an aggressor.

It is characteristic of the present order of things in UNO that the tiny Dominican Republic in America, for instance, which has scarcely two million inhabitants, now carries as much weight in UNO as India, and far more weight than the Chinese People's Republic, which has been deprived of a voice in UNO.

Thus UNO, while turning into an instrument of aggressive war, is at the same time ceasing to be a world organization of equal nations. In point of fact, UNO is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans, catering to the needs of the American aggressors. It is not only the United States of America and Canada that are striving to precipitate another war; this is likewise the course of the twenty Latin-American countries whose landlords and merchants are thirsting for another war somewhere in Europe or Asia, so that they might sell goods to the belligerent countries at super-

prices and make millions out of this bloody business. It is no secret to anyone that the twenty representatives of the twenty Latin-American countries now constitute the most compact and obedient army of the United States of America in UNO.

The United Nations is thus taking the inglorious path of the League of Nations. It is thereby killing its moral prestige and dooming itself to disintegration.

Question: Do you consider another world war inevitable?

Answer: No. At the present time, at any rate, it cannot be considered inevitable.

Of course, there are in the United States of America and Great Britain, as well as in France, aggressive forces who are thirsting for another war. They need war in order to rake in superprofits and to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires, who regard war as a paying proposition yielding gigantic profits.

These aggressive forces hold the reactionary governments in their grip and direct

them. But at the same time they fear their peoples, who do not want another war and stand for the maintenance of peace. They are therefore trying to use the reactionary governments to enmesh their peoples in a web of lies, to deceive them and represent another war as a defensive war, and the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as an aggressive policy. They are trying to deceive their peoples in order to foist their aggressive plans upon them and inveigle them into another war.

It is for this reason that they are scared of the peace campaign, fearing that it might expose the aggressive designs of the reactionary governments.

It is for this reason that they turned down the proposals of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a Pact of Peace, reduction of armaments and prohibition of the atomic weapon, fearing that the adoption of these proposals would frustrate the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and render the armament drive unnecessary.

How will this struggle between the aggressive and peace-loving forces end?

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the peoples take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and uphold it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in enmeshing the popular masses in a web of lies, deceiving them and inveigling them into another world war.

Hence a broad campaign for the preservation of peace, as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers, is now of paramount importance.

As to the Soviet Union, it will continue unswervingly to pursue its policy of preventing war and preserving peace.

Pravda, February 17, 1951

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

